Debunking *Look's*, "What Are They Hiding?"

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL I, NUMBER 34 SEPTEMBER 26, 1953 5 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Answering The Russian H-Bomb With An American Sales Tax?

"Operation Candor" The Same Old Pentagon Claptrap

Operation Candor, long awaited and highly advertised, seems to have begun in Boston this week. But judging by the Eisenhower speech it is merely to be reversion to government by alarm. Hope that desire for fiscal sanity might lead the Republicans toward peace died with the passage in which the President finally touched on the problem of the H-bomb. Here was the same mindless rhetoric with which the military in every age have been accustomed to inflame public opinion and inflate public expense.

The "enemies of freedom"—the other side is always the enemy of freedom—are now equipped "with the most terrible weapons of destruction." And what is to be our answer? The answer of the armament salesman, the answer which must be as old as the first flint-tipped spear. We can meet them, Eisenhower said, "with only one answer: there is no sacrifice—no labor, no tax, no service—too hard for us to bear" in the "defense of our freedom." This reopens the Treasury doors to the Pentagon and marks the victory of the military over the bankers. The brief honeymoon with economy is over. Never was candor less candid than in these windy phrases but the truth peeps out, particularly in the "no tax" reference. Apparently our answer to the Russian H-bomb is to be an American sales tax.

We are summoned to defend a freedom which is vanishing. What the President left unsaid is the testimony of our servitude. The enemies of freedom are equipped "with the most terrible weapons of destruction." What weapons? Have they the H-bomb? Or perhaps the newly feared C-bomb? Are they ahead of us or behind us? Have we more than they or less of the new weapons? Is there any real defense against them? How effective would the best defense be? How much would it cost? What did Project Lincoln report? What did the Kelly Report say? What was in Project East River?

We are as much in the dark as those who live under a dictatorship. A small group of men alone knows the facts. A small group makes the decisions. And—from on high—we are given the answer. "We can meet them with only one answer," Eisenhower announces. "No sacrifices—no labor, no tax, no service" is to be "too hard for us to bear." Ours not to reason why. Is this free government or an atomic Charge of the Light Brigade?

Is there no chance of agreeing on some form of atomic control? After all, bombs of this kind cannot be manufactured in a washtub. If we have instruments which tell us that a bomb has been exploded behind the Iron Curtain, can it be said that inspection and enforcement are impossible?

Would it not be better to try and make peace before embarking on a stepped up arms race in fission and fusion weapons? Can this lead to anything but the most terrible war of all history? The questions are left unanswered. Few voices will even raise them in a docile press dispensing a uniform pap. The decisions have been made. Eisenhower says there is "only one answer." This is the Pentagon's answer, the translation of the world's most difficult problems by the small boy mind. If the Russians shoot us dead once, we must be prepared to shoot them dead twice.

If Operation Candor were really to be candid, it would tell quite a different story. There is no complete defense against any weapon. When that weapon is as destructive as the new bombs, great cities can be destroyed if only a few attackers slip past the most elaborate and costly defenses, as they inevitably will. Only a few days before the President spoke, the Secretary of the Navy at Quantico, Virginia, said "the realistic question of total mutual destruction" may deter nations from using the new bombs. Why then go on piling up more A and H bombs if they may not be used? The effect is to increase fear and tension without increasing usable military power.

Remember the predictions of how much money would ultimately be saved when the new bombs made conventional weapons and armies unnecessary? Now the Secretary of the Navy says the increasing power of the new bombs "suggests that the need for improvement of the more conventional forms of warfare may well become greater rather than less, as we approach absoluteness in mass destruction." The more money we spend on atomic development, the bigger and better must be our conventional army, navy and air forces. The prospect for the military is rosy, for this way the sky is the limit on expenditure and on military power over our economy. "Freedom" is to be defended by creating a garrison State in America. The world is to be torn apart between two fearful giants, neither of which believes in telling its own people more than an elite at the top thinks good for them.

This speech will serve a useful purpose if it arouses the world between the two giants to a full realization of how bankrupt is American leadership, how suicidal is the direction in which it is leading. To see such vast power guided by such small minds one must go back to the age of dinosaurs. There is no protection against the new weapons of destruction except peace, and no way to have peace except by co-existence. Russia and America can live in the same world together. But neither can destroy the other without also destroying itself. This is what "Candor" would report if it were not another of those spurious and hateful military operations, another excursion in spreading poison and panic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Real Proportions of That Red Herring

The Answer to *Look's*, "What Are They Hiding?"

Perhaps to counter balance its often relatively liberal line, *Look's* current issue features a shocker "What Are They Hiding?" A staff member, Fletcher Knebel, was assigned to tally up the record of Congressional witnesses who have invoked the Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination. He covered "the millions of words of testimony" taken since 1948 by the House Un-American, Senate Internal Security and McCarthy committees, and comes up with the first count of its kind.

"Behind the scorching national controversy over the treatment of witnesses," *Look* begins dramatically, ". . . lie some stark facts." The facts, however, when stripped of alarmist rhetoric, turn out to be rather puny than stark.

A sample is the main finding. "Persons who have refused to affirm or deny membership in the Soviet-controlled Communist party," *Look* reports, "held key posts in 71 bureaus, agencies and departments of the Federal government from 1933 to 1952."

The phrasing is hopped-up to catch the unwary. There is poetic license in the reference to 71 "bureaus, agencies and departments." A careful reading shows that what Knebel is really reporting is that 71 former Federal office-holders invoked their privilege.

This is worth that second look few *Look* readers will give it. The years covered are 1933 to 1952. That is 20 years. Federal employment averaged some 2,000,000 a year during that period. There are no figures on turnover available. But obviously several times 2,000,000 persons were on the Federal payroll in those 20 years. Yet three committees of Congress in five years have been able to turn up only 71 past or present Federal jobholders who declined to say whether they were Communists.

Even if we assume for the moment—as *Look* leaves its readers to assume—that all 71 are or were Communists, that is an amazingly small number.

In those two decades, the Communists three times ran a candidate of their own for President. In 1932—their best year—they polled roughly one-fourth of one percent of the total vote. In 1936 their percentage fell to one-fifth of one percent and in 1940 to one-tenth of one percent.

If the proportion of Communists on the Federal payroll had been about the same as their proportion to the total electorate, there would have been 5,000 Communists employed by the government in 1932, 4,000 in 1936 and 2,000 in 1940.

In the same inflated style was *Look's* finding, "No less than 113 persons who invoked the Fifth amendment served in some unit of the armed forces." A headline based on this says "Fifth amendment pleaders . . . even penetrated . . . the armed forces."

There were more than 10,000,000 men in the armed forces. If the ratio of Communists in the armed forces during the last war was the same as their ratio to voters the year before Pearl Harbor, then there must have been about 10,000 Communists in the armed forces. To say that they "penetrated" the armed forces is melodramatic and misleading. The armed forces were drafted. Communists were not exempt.

"Perhaps the most spectacular infiltration of a war agency," *Look* says, was in the OSS. "Spectacular" seems an odd adjective when one goes on to read that there were "no less than ten people working for OSS who later invoked the Fifth amendment." If there were only ten Communists among the thousands employed by the OSS that was not much of an "infiltration."

Just what this "infiltration" did or was intended to do is not explained. Some of the men *Look* mentions in this connection carried out dangerous assignments for the U. S. Army. *Look* says one was "parachuted into the Balkans." Another was "parachuted behind German lines in France to operate radio installations for the French underground." *Look* does not say they betrayed their trust. It does not allege that they did anything wrong.

The most interesting figure of all turned up by the *Look* survey has to do with the question of espionage. The Congressional investigating committees have done their best for years to picture the New Deal and the Fair Deal as honeycombed with Soviet spies. *Look* provides an anti-climactic figure on this.

Look first adds the 113 members of the armed forces to the 71 Federal jobholders (the two figures overlap since some men figure in both categories) and comes up with a grand total of 175 "former Federal employees or members of the armed forces" who invoked the Fifth amendment.

Then *Look* reports, "At least 14 of these persons have declined to state whether they engaged in espionage against the United States."

It is surprising to learn that in all these hearings the most *Look* could find were "at least 14" who invoked the Fifth amendment when asked about espionage. *Look*, of course, leaves the reader to assume that this was the same as an admission.

Look does not tell its readers that in the eyes of the law—for reasons which are the fruit of long and bitter experience—invocation of the Fifth does not create an inference of guilt. It does not explain that there are circumstances in which an innocent man may "incriminate" himself by his own testimony. It does not recognize that a lawyer may sensibly advise a man with a radical past these days that it is safest to answer no questions at all which might possibly entangle him in some kind of prosecution.

Some of those named in the *Look* article undoubtedly are or were Communists. Some are not. Most of them have been put through the hoops—and the headlines—over and over again. The striking thing is that after so many investigations there are so few allegations of wrong-doing.

There are some striking cases in which there are serious allegations. But whether the allegations can be taken seriously is another matter. One man named in *Look* is alleged to have handed over atomic secrets. He has been hounded ever since the House Un-American Activities Committee made this charge in a special report on the eve of the 1948 elections. *Look* does not tell its readers that the Department of Justice said of these allegations in a formal statement at the time, "There is absolutely no competent proof here. . . . It is patently absurd and unbelievable that the Department of Justice in cases of this character would fail to institute prosecution, were the requisite evidence available."

The campaign to portray New Deal and Fair Deal as subversive plots has reached Orwellian proportions. It blares from every radio and is repeated in the pages of every popular magazine.

This much is true. Had Hoover been elected in 1932, there would have been few Communists or Socialists or radicals of any kind in the government. But a great deal would never have been accomplished. For the nature of that accomplishment—whether it "subverted" America or made it more stable—we summon a witness, Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson.

What did Benson tell worried farmers at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, last Saturday? "Look forward with confidence," Benson said. "You are not looking down into the abyss of the thirties. We are in the fifties and have tools . . . to build a sound economy."

These are the mechanisms the New Dealers fashioned, the wage and price supports the Republicans opposed as communist. The hounded radicals of today are the same men who helped create those tools.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• *Editor and Publisher,* I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, $5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, $6; England and Continental Europe, $10 by 1st class mail, $15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, $10 by first class mail, $20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

September 26, 1953 — Vol. I, No. 34

Quid Pro Quo

If Beria shows up in Washington, we are prepared to expedite J. Edgar Hoover's escape to Moscow.

Witty Fellow, Dulles

John Foster Dulles is developing unsuspected gifts as a wit. We recommend two passages in his opening address to the UN General Assembly. "The United States," he said at one point, with an almost audible chuckle, "does not want to see Russia encircled by hostile peoples." No doubt when our bases around the periphery of the Soviet zone are opened to international inspection it will be found that they are really social centers, with emplacements for samovars and large bins of *pirochki,* ready for Russian visitors.

We can almost hear Goering guffaw in his grave over another of our favorite passages in that speech. Dulles told the UN the Russian people had "not forgotten what their nation suffered from Hitlerite Germany during the second World War. They expect and they are entitled to, assurance against a repetition of such events." Dulles said, "That is, indeed, the large purpose of the European Defense Community."

Now that the Russians know we are rearming Germany in order to protect them from aggression, the least they could do would be to rebuild the Japanese Navy in order to protect us from another Pearl Harbor.

The A. F. of L.'s German Policy

In the dismay over Adenauer's victory, it is as well to remember that the German Social Democrats are today at least as arrogantly nationalistic as the German right. Their kind of thinking is reflected in the recommendations made by the executive council of the A. F. of L. at St. Louis this week on German policy. The A. F. of L., which has close relations with German Social Democracy, takes the "liberation" of the Eastern zone for granted and asks for more. It declares that the Russians can only demonstrate their sincerity by giving up East Prussia and forcing Poland to relinquish the Oder-Neisse territories. The A. F. of L. would, however, give "due consideration . . . to the national interests of the Polish people." It would have Russia compensate Poland by restoring territories annexed in the last war. And just to show its impartiality, the executive council adds that the Western powers cannot ask the Russians and Poles to make these concessions—without also arranging for France to give up the Saar.

The A. F. of L. and Chiang Kai-shek

The A. F. of L.'s foreign policy recommendations make John Foster Dulles look like an appeaser. The A. F. of L. finds "the widespread dissatisfaction" with the Korean truce terms "understandable" and is opposed to any settlement on the basis of partition. It is opposed to recognition of the Chinese Communist regime or its admission to the UN under any circumstances, though it recognizes sadly that "in the present state of civilization, such recognition cannot be limited to states with high moral standards." It criticizes Churchill for suggesting that Russia may have security problems, too, and finds it "most regrettable that, since talk of negotiations with Moscow has been in the air, the western powers have already made heavy reductions in their arms budgets." It says the Russians have been "stepping up aggressive military preparations—especially in the polar regions." The executive council does not propose to abandon the Eskimo, either, without a fight.

The Pentagon and the Public Mind

The armed services are spending more than $10,000,000 a year on "public relations." Mac Arthur had 175 military and civilian "publicity personnel." The Chief of Staff has 157. The National Council Against Conscription (1013 Eighteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.) has just published a 60-page pamphlet study, "Press Agents of the Pentagon" by John M. Swomley, Jr. (35 cents a copy) which we recommend as essential reading for all who would understand the way in which the Pentagon molds the public mind.

The pamphlet explains the methods by which opinion is formed. These range from the special "confidential" orientation meetings to which business, farm and labor leaders are invited down to the comic strips. "Much of Joe Palooka's comic strip when he was in uniform," Swomley reports, "was inspired by long conferences at the Pentagon. This was at the height of the UMT campaign when the Army wanted to sell children as well as parents on the idea that the Army was the place to build men like Joe Palooka—healthy, strong—who don't drink, smoke, swear or have other bad habits."

One the main purposes of the Pentagon in its "public relations" is to condition the public mind for war. The pamphlet quotes A. S. Alexander, then Under Secretary of the Army, as saying, "The American people are better psychologically prepared for war if it comes than ever before in peacetime." The Council says in conclusion that the difficulties of achieving a peaceful and disarmed world "should not be magnified by a military propaganda machine whose chief results are the creation of a militaristic public opinion and the maintenance of the vested interest of a military autocracy."

Whispers Around The Capital

Warren's reputation as a liberal and his opposition to loyalty oaths in California have been a major behind the scenes obstacle to the Supreme Court appointment he wants . . . In Indo-China, as in Korea, the satellites are more intransigeant than the big powers. While Moscow and Peking both are anxious to settle the Indo-Chinese war, Ho Chi-minh has grown more militant. On the other side, the French military, strengthened by the promise of more American aid, are in no mood for negotiations . . . Dulles favors a Pacific Pact like the Atlantic Pact and has been building up Congressional support for it but was unable to sell the idea to Australia and New Zealand at the Anzus meeting here. They shy away from a pact which would commit them to the support of Chiang Kai-shek against Communist China . . . The labor movement, after the deaths of Philip Murray and William Green, like Russia after Stalin, is in flux, and surprises are as possible in the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. as in Moscow . . . The rapidly improving relations between Tito and the Cominform bloc have given the Yugoslav leader new leverage in the dispute over Trieste. Serbia historically oscillated between East and West, and the pattern may be expected to repeat itself . . . Federal Judge Luther Youngdahl, once Republican Governor of Minnesota, the Judge who handed down the recent Lattimore decision, did not add to his popularity with the G-men and the crypto-Fascists of Washington by making a speech at the eight annual National Conference on Citizenship in which he said, "hatred of Communism is not enough to make for good citizenship." . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Adlai's 'Three Worlds' Based on Look at Half

Everyone will have perceived, I think, that travel has broadened our Mr. Adlai Stevenson. His disquisitions since returning have been unimpassioned, his advice temperate. Striving honestly to see us as others see us, he has brought back the distinct impression that our self-righteousness no longer is salable. He suggests that our diplomacy has about worn out the language of abuse. Somewhere along the way, perhaps in the zone of Winston Churchill's emanations, he has contracted the wholesome idea that live and let live, after all, makes sense.

The question rises now of what to do with our Mr. Stevenson this winter and next year till the elections: settle him quietly in his Chicago apartment to "make a living" or trot him out only from time to time to regale the gatherings of Democrats? A better use of him, it seems to me, would be to turn him around, while his recollections of Syngman Rhee, the emperor of Japan, Pope Pius and Queen Elizabeth still are fresh, and start him off on another around-the-world-in-six-months tour, this time on a different tack.

Thus we should be able to keep on broadening our statesman in experience and understanding. We should be able to anticipate even finer reports. For though Mr. Stevenson has viewed conditions and sampled thinking in a great many lands, in order to tell us how we stand with our "friends," many and more populous lands—those whose existence really disturbs us—were left unexplored. How it is with these is an information he can impart with no more authority than any other passer-by—a mishmash of rumors collected at the borders, of droppings caught under the eaves. It is reasonable to assume that a man of Mr. Stevenson's open mind and ready assimilation could learn as much by traveling in these terras incognitas as he has on a track that is fairly well beaten, and that another time he would return to us an even more rounded man.

If we should seriously consider a course of living and letting in the future, our project unquestionably would require a sum of fact in addition to the store we now think we possess. Our charts may be outmoded. Who would have suspected, for example, that in his circumnaviagtion Mr. Stevenson would have found Three Worlds where but a few years ago Wendell Wilkie saw but One? And is it not at least possible that, if Mr. Stevenson should pursue his studies in all the far corners, instead of merely in selected ones, he in turn would discover that humanity is indeed whole?

It is handsome for a man who has aspired to be President of the United States, and who yet may be, to have first hand knowledge of places like South Korea and Formosa and Turkey and Greece. But our book on such places already is relatively well scriven and annoted: our military and economic experts have poured over them at will. The statesman who could be of real value to us would be one who would have first hand knowledge not only of friendly lands and peoples but of the vast reaches and populations lumped into one—the hostile and hidden one—of Mr. Stevenson's three worlds. If it should appear that these lands are not too different from our own—subject to droughts, to depletion, to conservation and improvement—and that these peoples at bottom harbor impulses of human nature quite as philanthropic as our own, then our adjustment to a policy of co-existence need not be difficult at all.

In any case, it certainly is as important for the American people to be brought up to date on the disposition of the leaders of Russia and China as on the current viewpoint of the Pope and the emperor of Japan. Our relations with the latter are not in doubt. Our problem is to establish an understanding with the former. And whether Mr. Stevenson's greater aim is his own mental satisfaction or to complete his equipment for the high office in Washington, he could not better serve it than by resuming his journey and covering the rest of the field.

Many commentators have complimented Mr. Stevenson on the "judiciousness" of his estimate of the present situation of the world. The evidence, as far as Mr. Stevenson's "on-the-spot" investigation is concerned, cannot be all in. At best, he knows "the half of it." Unless with equal objectivity he personally surveys the hopes and humors of the other half, how can his balances be trusted?

Let him, when he has rested his feet, be off again to the "interesting spots" he has missed. His counsel thereafter will be the more deserving of respect.

Help Keep Dissent Alive In America
By Subscribing

I. F. Stone's Weekly

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. $5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

9-26-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Post Office Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED